Remarks

Claims 1-10, 12-25, 27, and 28 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 12, 13, 18, 23-25, and 27 and cancelled claim 11 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case.

The Examiner objected to the specification as not including a written description of Figs. 2 and 3. Applicants have amended the specification to include a description of Figs. 2 and 3. Since the written description only describes what is shown or duplicates text included in Figs. 2 and 3, the amendments to the specification do not represent new matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing every feature recited in the claims. Claim 11 is no longer pending. The means recited in claims 23 and 24 are included in the central unit shown in Fig. 2. This is clear from the content of Fig. 2. The amendments to the specification also address the issue regarding the reference characters that appear in Figs. 3-5. Applicants submit herewith corrected drawings including Fig. 3, which Applicants have amended to delete the reference character "31". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner objected to claims 4, 5, 8-10, 12, 13, 18, 23, 25, 27 and 28. Applicants have amended these claims where necessary to ensure that antecedent basis exists for all terms and along the lines suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Applicants agree with the Examiner's interpretation of the phrase voltage/phase angle. Claim 11 is no longer pending. Applicants have amended claims 23 and 24 to recite the various means. Applicants submit that claims 1-25, 27 and 28 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-15, 22-25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. patent publication 2004/0010350 to Lof et al. The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lof et al. The Examiner rejected claims 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lof et al. in view of U.S. patent publication 2001/0010032 to Ehlers et al.

Lof et al. does not disclose the invention recited in claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-15, 22-25, 27 and 28 since, among other things, Lof et al. does not disclose dimensioning an extent of power balancing measures for restoring to a normal condition an electrical power system that experiences or may experience a voltage collapse. The Examiner asserts that paragraphs 0065 and 0067 disclose dimensioning an extent of power balancing measures. However, these paragraphs merely disclose compensating a generated power by other generators. Such compensation does not disclose dimensioning. Analogously, neither "instruction to reduce a magnitude of each of the loads" disclosed in paragraph 0066 or "load shedding of a fraction of the total load" discloses dimensioning.

Lof et al. is a typical example of the prior art where a trial and error approach is adopted. This is further evidenced in paragraph 0067, which states, "Therefore, load shedding of a fraction of the total load in the load area (preferably low priority load) might be enough to save the whole system." In other words, Lof et al. discloses performing blind load shedding without any prior dimensioning. The method disclosed by Lof et al. may or may not be successful, depending on luck. The load shedding disclosed by Lof et al. may be over dimensioned, which can lead to more load shedding than is necessary.

On the contrary, the claimed invention includes "dimensioning an extent of the respective measure". In other words, the claimed invention first determines a magnitude for performing any measure. For example, loads may be disconnected according to a dimensioned power. The specification describes in detail examples of this. As a result of the dimensioning, the claimed invention is more likely to apply measures that are sufficient without over compensating for the imbalance, unlike the method disclosed by Lof et al.

In view of the above, Lof et al. does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-15, 22-25, 27 and 28. Since Lof et al. does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-15, 22-25, 27 and 28, the invention recited in claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-15, 22-25, 27 and 28 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) no difference may exist between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure. *See Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q. 841 (C.A.F.C. 1984).

Along these lines, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a cited reference, of each and every recitation, as set forth in the claims. *See Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs*, Inc., 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Lof et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 21 since, among other things, Lof et al. does not suggest dimensioning an extent of power balancing measures for restoring to a normal condition an electrical power system that experiences or may experience a voltage collapse. Even if Lof et al. were to suggest manual disconnection of loads, Lof et al. does not suggest dimensioning an extent of power balancing measures for restoring to a normal condition an electrical power system that experiences or may experience a voltage collapse. Therefore, Lof et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 21.

The combination of Lof et al. and Ehlers et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 16-20 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest dimensioning an extent of power balancing measures for restoring to a normal condition an electrical power system that experiences or may experience a voltage collapse. As discussed above, Lof et al. does not suggest such dimensioning. The Examiner only cites Ehlers et al. as suggesting a particular order of priority of disconnecting loads. Even if Ehlers et al. suggested such and we combined with Lof et al., the combination would still not suggest the invention recited in claims 16-20 since neither Lof et al. nor Ehlers et al. suggests dimensioning an extent of power balancing measures for restoring to a normal condition an electrical power system that

experiences or may experience a voltage collapse. Therefore, the combination of Lof et al. and Ehlers et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 16-20 and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do not disclose or suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Consequently, the references relied upon in the office action do not anticipate the claimed invention or make the claimed invention obvious. Hence, the claimed invention is patentable over the cited references and Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections based on the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and issuance of the notice of allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 7, 2009

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300